DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 088 407 HE 005 320

AUTHOR Martorana, S. V.
TITLE Organizing Approaches to Facilitate Student Mobility in Postsecondary Education.
PUB DATE 2 Dec 73
NOTE 21p.; Paper presented at the Airlie House Conference on College Transfer (Warrenton, Virginia, December 2-4, 1973)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50
DESCRIPTORS *Change Agents; College Students; Conference Reports; Educational Change; *Higher Education; *Post Secondary Education; *Student Mobility; *Transfer Students

ABSTRACT

Ten propositions for action organizing approaches to facilitate student mobility in postsecondary education are reviewed. The propositions are: (1) the organization of effort to resolve the problems of student mobility in postsecondary education should involve and mobilize both authorities with local and institutional responsibilities and those with a more global authority and perspective. (2) Educational institutions, organizations, and agencies need to be included and involved. (3) The organized professions and occupational groups should be brought into participation. (4) The effort should include the students, their families and other direct supporters. (5) Agencies and organizations concerned about "civil rights" and "consumer interests" need to be utilized. (6) Clear policies need to be developed. (7) A national network of "units of responsibility" needs to be created. (8) A nationwide linkage of operational data, advisory information and student records needs to be established. (9) Institutions and agencies need to adapt policies and practices which exert "operational leverage" in the student's interests. (10) A deliberated and coordinated thrust should be made to acquire the needed finances to accomplish the foregoing and also to acquire adequate financial assistance for the student. (Author/MJM)

ED 088407

AIRLIE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON COLLEGE TRANSFER
Airlie House, Warrenton, Va.
December 2-4, 1973

ORGANIZING APPROACHES TO FACILITATE STUDENT MOBILITY IN POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

S. V. Martorana
Professor of Higher Education and Research Associate
Pennsylvania State University

Topic: Organization of Effort

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
W. Todd Furniss
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

HE 005 320

This paper was prepared for a conference presentation and may not be reproduced in part or whole without written permission of the conference chairman, W. Todd Furniss, American Council on Education. It is expected that the conference papers and related materials will appear as a published book.

Someone has observed that it is harder to effect significant changes in higher education than it is to move a graveyard. But at times problem issues arise and persist that clamor for attention to resolve them and cannot be denied. Thoughtful observers and experienced practitioners in higher education today show no doubt that the challenge of meeting the needs of the mobile student is such an issue. If there are any remaining who would still argue the point they can certainly be quickly put to rout by expanding the definition of the educational field of concern from the more traditional notion of higher education to the increasingly more acceptable one of postsecondary education. When one considers the current evidences of student mobility and possibilities for expansion of such mobility among the many types of postsecondary institutions--public and private, two- and four-year, specialized and general, profit-making as well as non-profit--the dimensions of complexity and difficulty of handling the mobility become formidable, even fearsome. Yet this is the problem to which this conference is addressed and to which a more effective answer hopefully will emerge soon.

There is no need in this paper to review at length the nature of difficulties in facilitating student mobility, or as it is more popularly termed, the transfer problem, in postsecondary education. This has been very well done in the background paper distributed to all participants at this conference and at greater length and detail in a number of major studies like that reported in Kintzer's recent volume Middleman in Education.[1] From these sources comes clear indication that there is need to pay attention to the problem and that there is a growing pressure on all in postsecondary education to find ways to resolve it. The Carnegie Commission concluded that by the year 2000, community

colleges will probably be enrolling 40 to 45 percent of all undergraduates in college.[2] The presence of difficulties in helping students transfer from junior colleges to baccalaureate-degree institutions was identified by Koos in the '20s and examined in very penetrating fashion in the well-known national study by Knoell and Medsker some forty years later.[3] Yet in 1969, Hulburt was still able to report after studying plans for statewide development and coordination of higher education that there was little or no attention being given to the problems of transfer students.[4] The first "2+2 Conference" in New York State was held twenty-five years ago, yet today there is no statewide policy on accomodating student transfer. And here in late 1973, the American Council on Education in cooperation with the major national higher educational associations convenes a conference to consider ways to tackle the problem.

These observations are advanced not to be critical of the many and extended efforts of earlier years to find ways to cope with the problem of student mobility. Rather they are presented to emphasize the difficulty and persistence of the problem and to lead to the further observation that the pressures on all postsecondary institutions to do something about it are mounting. All indications are that student mobility from one type of postsecondary educational institution to others and from one level of such education to others (both upward and downward in the conventional view of community college, upperlevel undergraduate, and graduate and professional studies) is going to continue to increase for the foreseeable future. "Solutions to these problems must be found," says Wattenbarger in the foreword to Kintzer's book; and the cogency of his statement is indicated in one of the conclusions stated toward the end of the volume that "mounting evidence indicates that the remainder of the decade will bring greater involvement in and control of two-year/four-year college articulation by state agencies."[5] Kintzer goes on to decry the trend he identifies

and to recommend a greater reliance on "voluntary and cooperative efforts." Whether or not this recommended course of development can effectively accomplish the task at hand, however, is one of the questions that participants in this conference need carefully to explore; it is a question, also, to which a number of the propositions that this paper presents later on "organizational approaches" must be seriously related. Whatever may be the final conclusions, there seems no doubt that powerful, specific, and global actions are needed now to rectify current and past ills in handling student mobility and to assure that future handling of the problem will be better.

Clarifying Some Premises on Which to Start

Consideration of how an organized effort can be launched to resolve the complex transfer problem can perhaps start best by a suggestion of some basic premises on which one would hope the postsecondary educational interests would be agreed. Two seemingly simplistic ones can be stated first. One of these is that the postsecondary educational interests generally recognize that a problem exists and understand its nature. This seems to be a tenable statement in light of the considerable mass of attention being given to the problem and the fact that such a conference as this one was convened. A second is that there is general willingness among the postsecondary educational interests to help in the attack on and resolution of the problem. These possible premises are described as <u>seemingly simplistic</u> because, while they might first appear almost self evident as they are stated, there is substantial reason to be skeptical about the validity and general acceptability of both points. One is tempted to ask of this audience, because you are so well informed on the subject and understand the situation, the old Air Force management question, "Are you an answer to the problem or part a part of it?"

As already indicated, there have been many excellent analyses of the scope and depth of the problem; one of them is the fine background paper prepared by the staff for this conference. This large body of facts and analysis invites one to follow the role of the "double" in the short story, "My Double and How He Undid Me," saying simply, "There has been so much said on the subject and on the whole so well said that I shall not occupy more time," and close this presentation. But that cannot be done, for this is part of the problem--there has been much talk but relatively little action. A study reported by AACRAO in 1972 pointed this out dramatically and rather plaintively, "As we look," it said, after finding out which states had articulation agreements between two- and four-year colleges, "we find a wide discrepancy between the stated policy by state agencies or higher educational boards and the facts as reported by the junior institutions."[6]

Out of one's experience in field management of the problem and the general literature on the subject, however, seem to emerge consistently a number of points which can perhaps be accepted as points of departure for action. Stated topically, those believed defensible are: (1) that the interests of the student and those of the society he is to enter should be served in the attempt to attack the transfer problem; (2) that all available expertise and knowledge should be brought to bear in the effort; (3) that traditional practices and policies in postsecondary education should be tested against innovative and different ones; (4) that formal and informal, official and voluntary techniques ought to be applied; and (5) full advantage ought to be taken of the new technological developments in data gathering, exchange, storage, and retrieval. Members of this conference may wish to take issue with these or ask for an expansion of their definition and reason for their choice; they are presented in part to provoke that kind of discussion. The writer, however, views them as "givens."

Propositions for Action

With such premises for action in hand, attention now turns to some more concrete indications of the types of action which might follow. In this, the hope and intent again is to stir reaction, to urge movement toward decisions, and hopefully prompt follow-up behavior at their home locations on the part of the conferees on their return from Airlie House and, as important, by the American Council on Education and all of the supporting associations sponsoring this conference. Ten propositions for action will be suggested. They are not claimed to be original ideas, but are presented, rather, as distillations of personal observation and experience, participation in numerous meetings, conferences, and conventions on the subject, and a running examination of the study reports and other writings as these have been published. Neither, it should be noted, does the writer endorse fully the propositions in their stated form. They hold a measure of tenability and perhaps can be used effectively by a determined and coordinated effort. To serve more explicitly as guidelines for an "organization of effort" as a follow up to this conference and for related broader actions in the field, however, they need your careful and critical examination and evaluation.

In developing these propositions an attempt was made to focus on the specifics of an organizing approach to a new attack on the transfer problem. Your attention is called to the point that the first five propositions deal with the questions of who should be brought into the new effort, and the later ones propose what and how some specific actions believed to be desirable might be undertaken.

Proposition 1.--The organization of effort to resolve the problems of student mobility in postsecondary education should involve and mobilize both authorities with local and institutional responsibilities and those with a more global authority and perspective.

This recognizes two well-known facts about the way that problems in the academic realm are handled. One is that at the institutional level such problems require the positive attention and energy of faculty and other personnel who support direct instructional services to students, as well as boards of control and administrative staffs. The other is that at the state and regional levels policies and procedures for inter-institutional planning and coordination must rely for their ultimate accomplishment on the instructional staffs and the operating administrative personnel of the individual colleges and campuses. The reality of these observations and their importance to the transfer students, especially those who are not sophisticated in the ways of academe, is evidenced dramatically in Smith's statement concerning the aspirations of minority and disadvantaged students:

> These aspirations, however, soon fall by the wayside unless there are special efforts made to identify potential transfer students, beginning in the high school, give them the necessary supportive services they need in the freshman year of colleges, expose them to pre-enrollment programs at four-year institutions, and acquaint them with techniques for coping with the <u>bureaucracy of colleges and universities</u>.[7] (emphasis added)

The role of the department chairman in a four-year college or university in either aiding and abetting or effectively hindering transfer of students with advanced standing into the institution in documented. Indeed, individual faculty members play critical roles in determining the equivalency of prior education and training and judging its acceptability to programs and degrees offered at their institutions. Wattenbarger in 1972 developed a model for handling articulation problems on a state-wide basis which took into account the complex of interests typically found in a state higher educational program.[8] It provides an excellent start toward an expanded and refined model. Such a new model would be both more explicit in the way that individual institutions

might organize to face up to the transfer problem and how additional agencies and interests might organize to face up to the transfer problem. In addition, it would show how such interests might be accommodated when all postsecondary education (as opposed to the traditional college and university system) is taken into account.

And beyond such an expanded model that would be applied in a particular state or region, this proposition suggests that national interests and agencies need to be reached and involved. What these specifically should encompass will be taken up in the next proposition. The point to be emphasized as a guideline to action, is that there needs to be a mobilization of effort that builds on the smallest and most directly serving unit touching on the student (the individual faculty member and the academic department) through the state-level structure for postsecondary education, to those organizations which can and should exert influence from the nationwide perspective.

Proposition 2.--Educational institutions, organizations, and agencies, as well as non-educational organizations (in addition to the usual organized professions and labor) need to be included and involved.

Mobile students represent both a population of consumers of educational and training services and a body of talent needed by the economy of the nation and general society. As a consequence, accommodation of their educational and training needs is not entirely a matter to be left to the total discretion of persons managing the schools and colleges. It needs the attention also of certain other agencies and organizations whose spheres of interest and responsibility lie outside the educational realm. A role in this respect is generally conceded for interests of the organized professions and labor (more about these

groups will be said later), but the thought behind this stated proposition is to push the concept much farther than that. It is to suggest that the organization of effort that this conference should consider must encompass all kinds of social, economic, and governmental agencies which have a constituency that can be better served by an expanded and more flexibly operated opportunity for postsecondary education.

That is the answer suggested to the question: Who is to be reached in an organized effort to tackle the transfer problem anew? All non-educational agencies with constituencies as described, as well as educational groups, organizations, and agencies should be included and utilized.

An excellent illustration of the concept behind this proposition is the Servicemen's Opportunity College. As you know, it was inspired, supported, and finally implemented, not only by educational interests like the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, the leadership of individual two-year colleges, some state-level officials responsible for community and junior colleges, and personnel in the U. S. Office of Education, but very importantly and critically by several units in the Department of Defense. The concern of the latter group was for upgrading the education of the servicemen and finding all ways possible to do this. Much of the credit for the final successful implementation of the idea goes to their vision, persistence, and support.

From such an illustration, many other possibilities can be envisioned. Local, state, and federal civil service commissions, for example, have a clear concern for matching people to jobs. They can be drawn into the discussion to examine the relationships of postsecondary education and training

to job qualifications, in general, and, more specifically, to consider interchangeability of job eligibility earned through postsecondary education and training when this occurs in a variety of places and/or ways. Other examples of interested non-educational agencies and organizations that can similarly be seen participating in organized effort on behalf of the mobile student would be the National Association of Manufacturers and the National Chamber of Commerce.

In short, one can envision a model for involvement in the effort that would include at the local level, besides a clearly defined machinery touching all postsecondary educational institutions, a means for utilizing representatives of a number of other educational interests like the local chapter of the American Association of University Professors, faculty units for collective bargaining, and the Parent Teacher Association, and also a significant representation of other non-educational interests like the local Chamber of Commerce, city and county civil service commissions, Veterans Administration and employment office, and others that will be suggested by the next three propositions. A similar pattern of inclusion of both educational and non-educational interests would be developed at the state level in all fifty states. One like that would also emerge from the Association Transfer Group to attend to the task from a nationwide perspective.

Proposition 3.--The organized professions and occupational groups and their interests should be brought into the participation.

As already indicated, the voices of organized professions and labor are generally accepted in an advisory role by educational authorities to assist in formulating academic policies particularly those bearing on how academic programs should be relevantly related to the world of work. This

proposal, however, is singled out for more attention because there are related problems faced by the mobile students in meeting the requirements of academic degrees and certificates of proficiency in certain fields and acquiring the rights to practice in particular professions or occupations. Licensure requirements in many states are predicated on the applicant's having completed a related course of study toward a degree or certificate in an "approved" school or college in the state concerned. The result is a sort of cyclical requirement which puts the mobile student in a quandary. To be able to sit for an examination requires prior completion of a program in an in-state postsecondary educational institution; the institution has a rigid and perhaps unsympathetic approach to acceptance of "non-resident" credits towards its academic awards; and so it goes. To break such a cycle, concerned educators need to convince the state agencies responsible for licensing and the professional and occupational groups with which they relate that this is only fair to the student and, in the long run, a better service to the society at large.

Proposition 4.--The effort should include the students, their families and other direct supporters, and their interests.

This proposal may seem gratuitous because it duplicates the first of the basic premises of acting stated earlier in this presentation. Actually, it needs to be stated and examined because the premise, although almost universally verbalized, is so often and grossly violated in practices concerning the transfer student. Until recently, representatives of the mobile students themselves were included only rarely in the discussions from which policies on transferability of credit or the acceptance of credit earned through non-conventional means were formulated. Even now, the presence of students on

boards or committees that actually administer such policies is relatively rare.

The proposal, therefore, is that not only students be brought more fully into the operative groups in determining and administering transfer policies, but that others who can serve effectively as spokesman for students at local, state, and national levels should be invited and permitted to play active roles. This may be the Parent Teacher Association, neighboring student or youth organizations, or a chapter of the American Association of University Women at the local level. Officials of such groups, or ones like them, operating in their statewide and regional structures should be a part of the state-level machinery. And the National Student Association and other such voices for college students ought to be a part of the national structure.

Proposition 5.--Agencies and organizations concerned about "civil rights" and "consumer interests" need to be utilized and involved.

Although the Supreme Court of the United States recently refused to consider the argument that equality of educational support of the individual was a "fundamental interest" as some proponents of the concept in California contended, the concept of educational opportunity as a right rather than a privilege of American citizens appears to be growing throughout the country.[9] One can expect, therefore, that such organizations as the American Civil Liberties Union will be increasingly interested in examining cases where individuals seem to be treated "whimsically or capriciously" by responsible officials of an enterprise, public or private, which claims to serve the individual in pursuing his just due. Parallel observations to these can be described about the spreading interest in "consumer rights"

and the fair treatment of consumers of all kinds of services by the agencies which provide them.

This proposition suggests, then, that in such agencies as the ACLU and Ralph Nader's consumer protection organization might be found a new source of energetic strength on behalf of the mobile student. Such a proposition will be viewed by some in academe as a threat to its classical freedom and autonomy to decide and act on academic affairs. Another view can be that the age of accountability is upon all postsecondary education and cannot be denied. By inviting these possibly critical agencies to join in devising new and better ways to serve those who might be their clients in cases against postsecondary educational authorities, leadership of the new effort to resolve the transfer problem may turn potential antagonists into allies in a worthy cause.

Proposition 6.--As a first or early step, clear policies need to be developed which will guide postsecondary institutions in deciding whether to serve in a planned and coordinated fashion or on a basis of free competition among types and systems of institutions.

Assuming that the wide array of possibly influential groups that have been suggested thus far can, in fact, be persuaded to devote attention and energy to resolving the transfer student problem, there is a threshold question that first must be resolved. It is whether or not postsecondary education and its many and varied elements are to be viewed as an overall, coherent, coordinated enterprise, or alternatively, as a field of service in which the several elements are engaged in an open, competitive business.

Participants in this conference may find this proposition difficult to deal with, perhaps even distasteful, for again a suggested abandonment of faculty freedom and institutional autonomy can be seen. As indicated,

however, the proposition raises a fundamental question. And it must be faced, because its answer determines the logic of accomodating the transfer student within the postsecondary educational system as it is now generally structured in the several states, or for developing new techniques for delivering these educational services and validating results. If this latter direction becomes predominant, changes can be seen in structures that will be quite drastic. The question is so serious that it merits greater elaboration.

If the existing structures for postsecondary education in the several states, including public and private (profit and non-profit) institutions, are to solve the transfer problem themselves, the emphasis and expectation are that much more planning and coordination of their practices to accomplish the indicated purpose will be necessary. This can occur under either voluntary or official auspices, and there are proponents of each of these approaches. Indeed, there may be some of both types of emphasis in a given state, that is, voluntary arrangements as well as official ones. The point is that some mechanism for inter-institutional decision will be needed and some order will be worked out to effect the needed articulation of programs and credentialing practices.

If, in contrast, there is to be a "market model" of free competition among postsecondary institutions for students, quite a different picture can be seen. Some view it as a way to assure fullest accommodation of the mobile student; he takes his money and goes where he is best served. Before a conclusion that the mobile student will be well served is reached, however, the likely practices of the competing institutions need to be projected and evaluated. Will open competition force institutions to more

rather than less rigid practices, such as allowing only one point of entry to programs offered or insisting on completion of certain prescribed courses or years of study to earn degrees in order to get the student early and to keep him as long as possible? If so, will there need to be more external evaluating and credentialing agencies and what will this mean in terms of institutional organization and programming? Will an "open market" approach cause institutions to vie with one another for some particular types students and refuse to accept others, and if so, will the mobile students be among those sought as good prospects to insure institutional survival? (The word survival is used advisedly here, for in a free competition, survival of the organization becomes the paramount consideration; if this is not accomplished, all else is irrelevant as far as the institution is concerned. The question, of course, is will a system and practice in post-secondary education where institutional survival is the primary concern also be one which assures complete and effective service to all who need post-secondary education, including the mobile student?)

In this connection, the rising debate about statewide planning and coordination of postsecondary education merits mention. As already indicated, Kintzer recommends a greater reliance on voluntary as opposed to official mechanisms for formulating and coordinating articulation policies and procedures. In a recent paper presented to the ACE, James Perkins made a strong case for greater use of voluntary, "public benefit" types of structures for purposes such as these.[10] In contrast to his views, there is the evidence of growth in formal structures for statewide planning and coordination throughout the nation, a trend that has been given a new impetus by the "1202 Commissions" proposed, albeit not yet implemented, by the Higher

Education Amendments of 1972.[11]

Where all of this is going to come out cannot now be determined. As you ponder how best to organize an effort of national scale that conference participants can carry home and attempt to implement for the mobile student, however, the stated proposition and its serious implications must be examined carefully.

Proposition 7.--A national network of "units of responsibility" needs to be created.

An admonition often given to managers is that everybody's business is nobody's business or, in other words, if there is a task to be done it should be clarified and someone should be made directly responsible for getting it done. The advice seems applicable to the task of serving the mobile student. It seems to have become a challenge that everyone in postsecondary education agrees needs attention and resolution but few are making their primary functional objective. This proposition is that the condition be changed deliberately and rapidly.

To illustrate what might be done, consider the parallel of the "disadvantaged student." During the past decade or so, remarkable adaptations have occurred in all sorts of postsecondary educational institutions to accommodate more effectively students whose educational and economic backgrounds place them at a disadvantage. When the policy objectives of postsecondary education in state after state were clarified to declare that such students should be sought out, admitted, and assisted to succeed in every way possible, action did not stop with proclamations of the new policies and a hope that results would then flow naturally. There followed instead in state after state and institution after institution special and specific efforts to make sure that the declared policies were indeed implemented. Special vestibule

programs were created, outreach and development projects were launched, offices of special programs were created, added personnel were recruited, and high ranking administrative positions were created at both institutional and state levels to make sure the job was attended to and done as effectively as possible.

This experience is very good to note for two reasons: it shows the adaptability of postsecondary education when convincing pressures are put on it to meet new demands, and it reports a measure of success in effecting institutional change in a much needed direction. A comparable need exists to serve the mobile student and a comparable effort seems necessary. Consequently, this proposal is that there should be established in every postsecondary educational institution a special machinery for attending to the needs of transfer students, be they recent graduates of community or junior colleges, servicemen, veterans, spouses changing locations because of family relocations, or others. There should also be such an office, appropriately staffed, fiscally supported, and headed by an official of high rank, on the staff of every state agency responsible for postsecondary education; this would include such agencies as state boards of regents, state boards of education, state offices of planning and coordination, and state agencies responsible for community and junior colleges. The regional higher educational compacts like WICHE, SREB, and the New England Board should have similar offices. And there should be developed out of the Association Transfer Group which sparked this conference a similar center (not necessarily governmental) to continue to provide a national focus on the problem and its resolution. Participants in this conference should start now to formulate specific steps to cause this national network of responsible units to be established and to help it be effective in its work. Among its functions could be the periodic

amassing and reporting of information on the mobile student, special examining of particular problems identified, and organized assisting in efforts to acquire needed fiscal support for postsecondary institutions and agencies to serve transfer students better.

Proposition 8.--A nationwide linkage of operational data, advisory information, and student records needs to be established.

Lack of relevant and comprehensive operational data is a generally recognized impediment to better understanding and handling of the mobile student in postsecondary education. Being transient these students do pose some special problems to institutional record keepers. Even those who enroll as regular students, attending full-time in the more conventional institutions, that is, community colleges and universities as opposed to trade and technical institutes or correspondence schools, and completing recognized programs present problems because their records must be passed from one institution to another when they move. Many enroll in whatever type of institution is attended as special and part-time students and pose even more complicated difficulties to persons and agencies called upon to assist, advise, or work with them later. These include the institutions they seek to enter later, prospective employers, and others who wish to have completely compiled descriptions and evaluations of a student's postsecondary educational experience wherever it is acquired.

The difficulties, however, certainly need not continue to be overwhelming. New developments in communications technology, data gathering, and information retrieval suggest that past negative conclusions about the accession and manageability of records need no longer be accepted. The University of Illinois, for example, has developed an extensive computer network termed PLATO and through it reaches an impressive network of schools

and colleges. For many years the New York Board of Regents has been promoting the development of Regional Reference and Research Libraries because they could use the most advanced techniques of information compilation and retrieval. A comparable thrust toward connecting postsecondary educational institutions on a statewide, regional, and perhaps even national basis for purposes of record keeping, reporting, and exchange on behalf of the mobile student seems not only to be feasible but necessary.

Proposition 9.--Institutions and agencies, whether official or voluntary, having duties and concerns for the mobile student need to adapt policies and practices which exert "operational leverage" in the student's interests.

Earlier in this paper the proposition was made that both agencies with primary duties in postsecondary education and those whose concerns were not primarily in this realm but whose constituencies had a stake in postsecondary educational opportunity should be brought into the effort to resolve the transfer problem. The proposal now advanced is that all such organizations and agencies (educational and non-educational) should be encouraged to exert "operational leverage" on behalf of the mobile student. This is to say that each locus of authority, be this authority derived from the voluntary participation of the constituency involved or from an official legal or regulatory source in a locality, state, or the nation, should be persuaded to exert a visible and forceful leadership role. The "operative leverage" of the American Association of University Professors, for example, might be the launching of a major policy study group to produce for its membership a statement on student mobility and the attendant rights and responsibilities of members of the Association comparable to that published on academic freedom in 1968[12] and on faculty dismissal in 1958.[13] The "operational leverage" of the

Veterans' Administration could be a kind of "affirmative action" policy and administrative follow up on behalf of veterans seeking advanced credit for study and training completed in service schools. A state coordinating board could call for statewide inter-institutional reporting and information exchange on admissions, retentions, and graduations of students entering as transfers. Individual institutions can require periodic examination of departmental implementation of institutional policies on transfer students. Many other possibilities can surely be envisioned by this audience. The point is that if results are to be realistically expected, two related actions are needed: (1) encouragement of voluntary actions on the part of institutions and, (2) exploration of possible uses of reasonable and justifiable requirements and related sanctions on the part of other validly concerned and involved authorities.

Proposition 10.--A deliberate and coordinated thrust should be made to acquire the needed finances to accomplish the foregoing and at least equally important to acquire for the student adequate financial assistance to support mobility essential to his postsecondary educational needs.

This proposition is almost self evident and only a short two-point elaboration is needed. The first point is that, obviously, many of the proposals advanced earlier are without prospect of constructive help to the mobile student if the proposals are not financed adequately. This may be a real stumbling block to the entire idea of a coordinated mobilization of effort from this conference. Postsecondary education today is not in a time of high public favor. To get the needed fiscal resources to carry out the proposals presented (if they are deemed worthy of further attention and action) will be a major and very difficult undertaking.

But beyond this, the second point is that, as a minimum, a stronger financial aid base for transfer students is an essential. The relative disadvantage of transfer students in comparison to regular freshmen enrollees in terms of financial aid has long been noted and reported. However, it still persists. The New York State Regents 1964 Statewide Plans for Higher Education called for special financial aid for transfer students. Yet the 1973 articulation conference recommended a "program of transfer incentive grants" and said, "Proposals for Transfer Incentive Grants. . . have been around since 1964 but each year the legislature has found, with diminishing majorities, other items more important. ACUSNY wants to lay more groundwork this year, on the hunch that 1974 is the year!"[13]

Conclusion

The spirit of persistence and optimism ACUSNY is expressing may well be a guide to this conference. To be sure, the problems of articulation, accommodation of the mobile and transient students, and of developing greater flexibility in postsecondary education seem ageless and endless. Yet there has been progress and an attitude of great pessimism should not prevail. Neither, however, can the effort be relaxed. There are serious pressures on all postsecondary education to serve its constituency more fully, flexibly, effectively, and efficiently. These criteria put a tremendous burden on all at this conference and colleagues throughout the nation. One would hope that in attacking the problems of the mobile student, all will make 1974 "the year."